DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 188 211 CS 205 637

AUTHOR Roberts, Nancy L.
TITLE From Pumps, Pearls, and Pleats to Pants, Briefcases, and Hardhats: Changes in the Portrayal of Women in Advertising and Fiction in "Ladies' Home Journal," 1960-62 to 1974-76.
PUB DATE Aug 80
NOTE 37p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism (63rd, Boston, MA, August 9-13, 1980). Print marginally legible.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Advertising; Comparative Analysis; Content Analysis; *Females; Feminism; *Fiction; *Media Research; *Periodicals; *Sex Role; Social Change; Trend Analysis
IDENTIFIERS *Ladies Home Journal

ABSTRACT

A content analysis of issues of "Ladies' Home Journal" drawn from the early 1960s and from the mid-1970s was conducted to determine if fiction and advertising in the magazines had shown any response to the women's movement and if there was a difference between fiction and advertising in their response to that movement. A total of 12 issues of the magazine from the prefeminist movement period of 1960-62 (before the publication of Betty Friedan's "The Feminine Mystique") and 12 issues from the period 1974-76 (the period following the most active feminist movement stage) were analyzed. The analysis included 42 fiction stories and 381 advertisements from the first period and 19 fiction stories and 470 advertisements from the second period. The ads and stories were classified as either "domestic" or "nondomestic." The findings showed that while fiction appeared to remain consistently traditional in its portrayal of women in the two periods, advertising showed a measurable degree of change, with more nondomestic, active, nontraditional portrayals of women in the second period than in the first. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED188211

Magazine Division

FROM PUMPS, PEARLS, AND PLEATS TO PANTS, BRIEFCASES, AND HARDHATS: CHANGES IN THE PORTRAYAL OF WOMEN IN ADVERTISING AND FICTION IN LADIES' HOME JOURNAL, 1960-62 to 1974-76

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Nancy L. Roberts

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

By

Nancy L. Roberts
Teaching Associate

School of Journalism and Mass Communication
University of Minnesota
111 Murphy Hall
206 Church St. S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 373-3565

Presented to the Magazine Division,
Association for Education in Journalism
Annual Convention, Boston, Massachusetts,
August, 1980

CS205637

Contents

Introduction..... 1

Literature Review..... 5

Methodology..... 8

Findings..... 10

Content Analysis of Ladies' Home Journal:
Period I (1960, 1961, 1962)

A. Fiction..... 11

B. Advertising..... 12

Content Analysis of Ladies' Home Journal:
Period II (1974, 1975, 1976)

A. Fiction..... 13

B. Advertising..... 14

Discussion..... 14

Conclusion..... 21

Four pages of data located between pages 10 and 11.

Introduction

In the early 1960s, a spate of literature appeared that indicted the mass media for its "sexist" portrayal of women. Betty Friedan (The Feminine Mystique, 1963) and Marya Mannes (But Will It Sell?, 1964) were among the first to awaken the public to the media's "babies and brooms" portrayal of women. Friedan objected to articles and advertisements, especially in the women's magazines, which rarely pictured women outside of their homes, and which limited women in the decisions they were allowed to make in their homes:

> The image of women that emerges from this big, pretty magazine (McCall's) is young and frivolous, almost childlike; fluffy and feminine; passive; gaily content in a world of bedroom and kitchen, sex, babies, and home . . . the only goal a woman is permitted is the pursuit of a man. 1

Mannes similarly lamented the daily exaltation of "the housewife image" by the mass media:

> In the fiction in the mass women's magazines the heroine is never brilliant, original, creative, or ambitious. In all the ads in all the media, woman steps out of her four-walled role only long enough to drive the car to school, to the hairdresser, or to market. 2

"Judging from the women's magazines today," Friedan wrote in 1963, "it would seem that the concrete details of women's lives are more interesting than their thoughts, their ideas, their dreams." By the year 1950, she pointed out, only one out of three heroines in the women's magazines was a career woman, and she was usually shown in the act of renouncing her career and discovering that what she really

wanted to be was a housewife. The 1950s and 1960s resounded with paeans to "Occupation: Housewife," Friedan charged, backing her assertions with the first serious, well-publicized appraisal of fiction in the women's magazines.

Once Friedan initiated the attack, others followed, creating a substantial body of protest literature. By the late sixties, advertising had come under fire as well. Lucy Komisar in "The Image of Women in Advertising" maintained:

> Advertising . . . spews out images of women as sex mates, housekeepers, mothers, and menial workers - images that perhaps reflect the true status of most women in society but which also make it increasingly difficult for women to break out of the sexist stereotypes that imprison them.
>
> (Advertising) . . . legitimizes the idealized, stereotyped roles of women as temptress, wife, mother, and sex object, and portrays women as less intelligent and more dependent than men. 3

By 1968, feminism competed successfully with the Vietnam War, student revolts, and inflation for public attention; female activists were picketing the Miss America contest, storming meetings of professional associations to demand equal employment opportunities, and forcing their way into male bars and restaurants in many cities.[4]

By 1970 the conflict culminated in a confrontation between militant feminists and the editors of Ladies' Home Journal, a leading women's magazine. On March 19, 1970, about 150 feminists staged a sit-in at the offices of Downe Communications, owner of the Journal, to support editorial alternatives to the magazine's stereotypical portrayals of women. Shortly

after, 46 of the women researchers and reporters and the sole woman writer at Newsweek filed charges that the magazine violated Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; similar charges were filed that year against Time, Inc. and the Washington Post.

Clearly by the early seventies, which were characterized by feminist outcry against sexist media stereotypes, and against sexist employment policies, Friedan, et. al.'s outburst had achieved some results. There are some clues that point to the importance of the Friedan, et. al. protest literature in affecting subsequent media content. Some of these clues appear in the trade journals in the form of caveats to advertisers about stereotypically portraying women. Starting in the mid-sixties, the pages of Sales Management, Printers' Ink, Advertising Age, Journal of Marketing, The National Underwriter, Marketing/Communications, and even the conservative Editor and Publisher, are filled with articles on the women's movement and its implications for advertisers. Careful reading of these articles provides insights into the minds of advertisers; these insights may well explain why they deal with this issue as they do.

These articles in the trade journals include those that present general observations on the changing female market, including practical tips on appealing to "today's new feminist;" "trend" articles that call attention to the new working woman market; and articles that point out the advertisers' neglect of such working woman subspecies as

the female business executive and the modern woman who may very well need life insurance. These same trade journals also include stories that directly cover the women's movement, as a news event; for example, straight news reporting on speeches by Friedan that decry advertising's use of sex role stereotypes - proof, perhaps, that advertisers took those protests seriously.

A key issue here is: to what degree can we say that protest literature of the Friedan type affects subsequent media content? It is difficult to attribute change to a given source of protest because there may always be other, scarcely imagined causes for that change.

Finally, "media content" should be carefully clarified, because protest literature may have far different effects on the content of subsequent advertisements, for example, than it might have on the content of subsequent fiction or nonfiction articles.

So far there has been sex role stereotype research on different types of magazine content - i.e., advertising, fiction, nonfiction - almost always studied separately. Little research has yet been published that examines more than one type of content within a single magazine. The purpose of this paper is to help bridge this gap by reporting on an original content analysis survey of Ladies' Home Journal, long one of the leading women's magazines (and the target of the 1970 militant feminist sit-in). Surveyed material includes both fiction and advertisements for the pre- and

post-feminist movement periods: I. 1960, 1961, 1962 (just before Betty Friedan's 1963 polemic), and II. 1974, 1975, 1976 (the period following the most active feminist movement stage, according to many historians).

This study set out to answer these questions:

1) Did fiction show any response to the women's movement?

2) Did advertising show any response to the women's movement?

3) Was there a difference between fiction and advertising in responsiveness to the women's movement?

Literature Review

Most of the studies of sex role stereotypes in fiction for the 1960s and 1970s have indicated little significant change in the way women are being portrayed, since Betty Friedan's The Feminine Mystique appeared in 1963. Bailey reported that the "happy housewife" image in the fiction of McCall's, Good Housekeeping, and Ladies' Home Journal (the three leading women's magazines) was even more widespread in 1967 than in 1957.[5] Franzwa's analysis of the same three magazines' fiction, 1940 to 1970, indicated that the role of housewife-mother was consistently supported by the recurrence of favorable themes.[6] The 1940-1970 analysis of women's magazines (Ladies' Home Journal, McCall's, and Good Housekeeping) by Stolz, et. al., indicated that the proportion of women portrayed as housewives in magazine fiction actually rose

slightly over time, while the proportion of working married women remained low in comparison to their actual numbers.[7] Dier and Lazer's 1978 study of male and female occupational roles in magazine fiction supported earlier, conservative conclusions.[8]

Little change seems to have occurred, either, in the area of nonfiction. Newkirk concluded there was "gradual and minimal change" in female role portrayals in nonfiction in Mademoiselle and Redbook, 1966-1974.[9] Kidd's 1975 study of advice on interpersonal relations in popular magazines (including many women's magazines) asserted that for the period studied, 1951 through 1973, "females and males were expected to behave according to traditional patterns - the woman as passive homemaker and the man as aggressive breadwinner."[10]

In The Feminine Mystique, Friedan denounced advertising as well as fiction and nonfiction:

> An American woman no longer has a private image to tell who she is, or can be, or wants to be. The public image in the magazines . . . is designed to sell washing machines, cake mixes, deodorants, detergents, rejuvenating face creams, hair tints. [11]

Since Friedan's observations, research studies have focused increasingly on the portrayal of sex roles in advertising. Much of the research has investigated general audience magazines, and has been of an administrative research nature, appearing in such journals as Human Resources Management, and the Journal of Marketing Research. As such, however, its

approach may be even more critical than purely scholarly studies.

Courtney and Lockeretz published the benchmark study of sex role stereotypes in magazine advertising in 1971.[12] Examining seven general-audience magazines, the researchers noted that not a single woman was shown as a professional business person; women were rarely shown out of the home by themselves or with other women; men were depicted regarding women as "sex objects" or else as in a domestic role (sometimes both); women were most often portrayed in ads for food products, cleaning products, home appliances, beauty products, drugs, clothing; males were most often linked in the ads with cars, travel, alcoholic beverages, industrial products, industrial companies, cigarettes, banks, entertainment media.

Twenty months later, Wagner and Banos in their follow-up study did not find data sufficient to conclude that there was a significant change in the portrayal of women.[13] And in 1974 when Culley and Bennett duplicated the Courtney and Lockeretz study, they echoed the conclusions of Wagner and Banos.[14]

Venkatesan and Losco's 1975 study of the portrayal of women in magazine advertising, 1959-1971 indicated that women were portrayed as housewives more often in the 1959-1963 period than at any other time in the study, paralleling the conclusions of other fiction researchers.[15]

Belkaoui and Belkaoui analyzed women's roles in eight general audience magazines for the years 1958, 1970, and 1972, and they found that overall, women were still shown as taking care of their homes and their personal appearances, with primarily household-and beauty-related buying decisions to make; while men, as Courtney and Lockeretz had shown, were associated with the "big-ticket" items.[15A]

Alison Poe's examination of "Active Women in Ads" (Saturday Evening Post, Life, Ladies' Home Journal, Cosmopolitan), indicated that "over time the representation of women in sports did not increase but in fact lessened, the quality and quantity of images of active women in 1928 (the year the first full team of American women participated in the Olympics) being significantly greater in 1928 than in 1956 and 1972."[16]

Among those who have partially bridged the gap left by studies that deal separately with magazine fiction, nonfiction, and advertising, is Lovelle Ray. Her 1972 study examined fiction and nonfiction in McCall's and Ladies' Home Journal, 1965-1970. She found that "despite the fact that there is an almost equal number of housewives and working women in the fiction"in both magazines, "this represented no break with tradition: Most of the working girls were single and still husband-hunting."[17]

Methodology

To help bridge the gap created by research that has dealt separately with the different kinds of magazine content,

this study examined both fiction and advertising in Ladies' Home Journal.

For the pre-feminist movement period of 1960, 1961, 1962 (just before Betty Friedan's polemic of 1963), a total of 12 issues, four for each year, were analyzed:

1960: January, April, July, October

1961: February, May, August, December

1962: March, June, September, November

From these 12 issues, a total of 42 fiction stories (all the stories which included a female character 18 years of age or older) were analyzed. All ads at least a half page in size - a total of 381 - were analyzed.

For the post-feminist movement period of 1974, 1975, 1976 (the period following the most active feminist movement stage, according to many historians), a total of 12 issues, four for each year, were analyzed:

1974: January, April, July, October

1975: February, May, August, November

1976: March, June, September, December

From these 12 issues, a total of 19 fiction stories (all the stories which included a female character 18 years of age or older) were analyzed. All ads at least a half page in size - a total of 470 - were analyzed.

Both ads and fiction were classified as "domestic" (portraying women primarily in a homemaker, mother, or wife role), or as "nondomestic." When categories overlapped, the more dominant role portrayal was selected for classification.

Such categories may seem simplistic when compared to the more elaborate ones of Suzanne Pingree, et. al.[18] However, the purpose of this study was to take an initial "reading" of advertising and fiction portrayals for the pre- and post- feminist movement periods. Indeed because "domestic" and "nondomestic" are such general categories, they serve well this purpose.

Findings

In Period I, advertisements were invariably pitched to housewives; women were shown primarily in domestic contexts, with their families; rarely were women shown outside the home, and if so, they were usually in a dating situation and rarely working. Ads for beauty, health, cooking, and cleaning products abound in the 1960, 1961, 1962 pages of Ladies' Home Journal. Women were used "decoratively" to a much greater extent than in Period II; in Period I, a woman's hand (manicured and wearing a wedding band) often appeared in displays, performing kitchen tasks with the advertised product (such as pouring a can of Hunt's Tomato Sauce into a pot).[19]

As such, the ads of 1960, 1961, and 1962 are consistent with the bulk of the fiction for this period, which is standard, traditional, and domestic.

Fiction in the 1974, 1975, and 1976 pages of Ladies' Home Journal did not become significantly less traditional than that of the early 1960's. It is in advertising, however,

PERIOD I: DOMESTIC/NONDOMESTIC PORTRAYALS

Both advertisements and fiction in the following random magazine sample were classified as "domestic" (portraying women primarily in a homemaker, mother, or wife role), or as "nondomestic." When categories overlapped, the most dominant role portrayal was selected for classification.

Total issues investigated for Period I: 12

1960 (January, April, July, October)

Advertisements:	N=151	Fiction:	N=17
Domestic:	142 (94.04%)	Domestic:	13 (76.48%)
Nondomestic:	9 (5.96%)	Nondomestic:	4 (23.52%)

1961 (February, May, August, December)

Advertisements:	N=94	Fiction:	N=14
Domestic:	86 (91.49%)	Domestic:	11 (78.58%)
Nondomestic:	8 (8.51%)	Nondomestic:	3 (21.42%)

1962 (March, June, September, November)

Advertisements:	N=136	Fiction:	N=11
Domestic:	120 (88.24%)	Domestic:	9 (81.82%)
Nondomestic:	16 (11.76%)	Nondomestic:	2 (18.18%)

Period I Totals (for all twelve months)

Advertisements:	N=381	Fiction:	N=42
Domestic:	342 (91.34%)	Domestic:	33 (78.58%)
Nondomestic:	33 (8.66%)	Nondomestic:	9 (21.42%)

PERIOD II: DOMESTIC/NONDOMESTIC PORTRAYALS

Both advertisements and fiction in the following random magazine sample were classified as "domestic" (portraying women primarily in a homemaker, mother, or wife role), or as "nondomestic." When categories overlapped, the most dominant role portrayal was selected for classification.

Total issues investigated for Period II: 12

1974 (January, April, July, October)

Advertisements:	N=157	Fiction:	N=6
Domestic:	121 (77.08%)	Domestic:	4 (66.67%)
Nondomestic:	36 (22.92%)	Nondomestic:	2 (33.33%)

1975 (February, May, August, November)

Advertisements:	N=138	Fiction:	N=6
Domestic:	112 (81.16%)	Domestic:	4 (66.67%)
Nondomestic:	26 (18.84%)	Nondomestic:	2 (33.33%)

1976 (March, June, September, December)

Advertisements:	N=175	Fiction:	N=7
Domestic:	143 (81.72%)	Domestic:	6 (85.72%)
Nondomestic:	32 (18.28%)	Nondomestic:	1 (14.28%)

Period II Totals (for all twelve months)

Advertisements:	N=470	Fiction:	N=19
Domestic:	376 (80%)	Domestic:	14 (73.69%)
Nondomestic:	94 (20%)	Nondomestic:	5 (26.31%)

ACTORS IN PERIOD I ADVERTISEMENTS

Advertisements were also classified according to the sex(es) of the actors: (one woman alone; two or more women; one woman and one man (usually a dating situation)), and according to these additional criteria: family or non-family situation; and purely decorative pose (i.e. a woman's hand or leg as part of the display).

1960	One woman	Two or more women	Family situation	Non-family	Dating	Purely decorative
January	15	0	9	0	1	5
April	25	3	7	4	1	2
July	19	2	6	1	1	6
October	27	2	5	3	1	6
N =	86	7	27	8	4	19
(% of total)....	56.95%	4.63%	17.8%	5.29%	2.64%	12.58%

(Total Ads: 151)

1961						
February	16	1	5	1	1	7
May	14	3	4	2	1	5
August	5	2	3	0	2	3
December	12	0	4	0	0	3
N =	47	6	16	3	4	18
(% of total)....	50%	6.38%	17.02%	3.19%	4.25%	19.14%

(Total Ads: 94)

1962						
March	12	3	5	1	2	3
June	14	2	8	0	2	5
September	16	2	8	0	1	5
November	20	6	9	1	0	11
N=	62	13	30	2	5	24
(% of total)	45.58%)	9.55%	22.05%	1.47%	3.67%	17.64%

(Total Ads: 136)

16

17

PERIOD I TOTALS:

Total Ads: 381	195	26	73	13	13	61
(% of total)....	51.18%	6.82%	19.16%	3.41%	3.41%	16.01%

that the greatest amount of change is observed. From 8.66% nondomestic portrayals in Period I, this category grew to 20% for Period II. Although most of the products advertised still were primarily those connected with beauty, health, food, and cleaning, women were now being shown in many more, nondomestic roles - as the advertising studies cited have indicated.

Content Analysis of Ladies' Home Journal: Period I (1960, 1961, 1962)

A. Fiction

Of the total of 42 fiction stories examined, 9 (21.42%) were categorized as nondomestic portrayals, while 33 (78.58%) were domestic.

Throughout the fiction of this period, women's problems were seen as resulting from their inability to perform as "ideal" housewives and mothers. In the July 1960 issue, a dissatisfied wife mused, "I have been thinking about the kind of husband I would like. He would be fine and strong and head of the house." [20] In another story, sex role stereotypes are clearly evident as a musically gifted daughter abandons her career plans for marriage, at her mother's gentle, portrayed-as-wise urging.[21]

Many of the nondomestic fiction portrayals need to be qualified, however. The heroine of "The Fluff," Sara Dana, was "twenty-six, long-legged, size ten; she had brown hair, gray eyes and a jaw that was, oh, maybe just a shade

too competent" (January 1960). In the end it was a male who delivered Sara, a working woman, from a difficult situation and she opted for the traditional solution in most of the women's magazine fiction of this era: marriage.

B. Advertising

Of a total sample of 381 ads, 33 or 8.66% were classified as nondomestic, while an overwhelming 342 or 91.34% were domestic.

Typical of the traditional tone of the early 1960s ads was the pastel-pink clad mother serving pancakes to her family in an ad for Aunt Jemima Pancakes and Kraft Preserves (April 1960). In the early 1960s, in the women's magazines, the dress code was pumps, pearls, and pleats. Women featured in a Singer Vacuum Cleaner ad in this issue wore this uniform, while the impractical woman painting her living room wall with Kem-Tone Paint wore a lacy apron, as well.

The women in the ubiquitous Maidenform Bra ads wore much less. One appeared in the May 1961 issue: A woman clad in clingy satin pants, high heels, and a brassière, pranced on a tightrope strung at twilight above a glittery city, saying, "I dreamed I walked a tightrope in my Maidenform Bra."

Typical of the "nondomestic" ads of Period I are three ads in the July 1960 issue: One portrayed a dating situation, one was an ad for Sucaryl, a food product; and the third, an

ad for the S.S. Hope, showed a female nurse instructing female student nurses.

Content Analysis of Ladies' Home Journal: Period II (1974, 1975, 1976)

A. Fiction

Of the total of 19 fiction stories examined, 5 (26.31%) were categorized as nondomestic portrayals, while 14 (73.06%) were classified as domestic.

"The Season" (February 1975) portrayed a new kind of fiction heroine: the working, career woman-mother. In this particular story, family conflicts were eased by the mother's choice of work place, the home - not the ideal setting - but the Journal here departed from the usual nonworking portrayals of women. Perhaps the most complete departure from traditional portrayals was "People Are Hard to Fix," which featured Felicia the washer repairperson (August, 1975). This heroine tooled about town in her van on service calls, much to her customers' surprise. To her young son, Felicia mused:

> Everybody's different. You're good at arithmetic and swimming and Sam can draw and Daddy's good at solving problems at his office. And I'm good at fixing machines. I know it's a funny thing for a mother to do but I'm good at it.

Not only was the Journal featuring a married career woman; she did not work at home, and her job was in a traditionally male preserve, technology.

B. Advertising

Of a total sample of 470 ads, 94 or 20% were nondomestic, while 376 or 80% were domestic.

Overall, the ad picture is one of change. In the February 1975 issue, for example, Sheer Energy Hose portrayed a female sportscaster at a football game; Stayfree Maxipads showed a woman dancer practicing in her studio; Parliament Cigarettes featured a female film producer, busy on the job, as did Excedrin (with this caption: "There's no room in my schedule for a headache").

Fram/Autolite Car Care Products featured professional truck driver Linda Jean Jernigan tinkering under the hood of her truck (March, 1976). "If you can change the filter in your coffee machine," she commented, "you can change the air filter in your car."

But some of the ads remained traditional. Calgon continued to show the woman luxuriating in the giant daiquiri glass, in a bubble bath ("Pour yourself a Calgon Bath. Don't stir. Just relax."). A woman in a Revlon Touch and Glow (make-up) ad gushed, "I'm intelligent. That's why I'm so pretty..." And in the September 1976 issue, Oil of Olay ran a headline over their ad which inquired, "Would <u>he</u> like you to look younger?"

<u>Discussion</u>

It is not surprising that only 8.66% of the ads in <u>Ladies' Home Journal</u> for Period I (1960, 1961, 1962) were

classified as nondomestic. As Betty Friedan had noted in 1963, the July, 1960 issue of McCall's (and indeed, all women's magazines in the pre-feminist movement period), was extremely traditional:

> The image of woman that emerges from this big, pretty magazine is young and frivolous, almost childlike; fluffy and feminine; passive; gaily content in a world of bedroom and kitchen, sex, babies, and home . . . the only goal a woman is permitted is the pursuit of a man. 22

When the feminine uniform in the ads consisted of pumps, pleats, and pearls, an advice column in Ladies' Home Journal summed up the day's stereotypes in its checklist for the happy wife:

> DO YOU:
>
> 1. Prefer homemaking to any other career?
> 2. Enjoy spending time with children?
> 3. Really try to get along with other people?
> 4. Usually look upon life's bright side?
> 5. Find most persons easy to like?
> 6. Value their good opinion of you?
> 7. Manage your temper easily?
>
> ARE YOU:
>
> 8. Orderly and systematic in your habits?
> 9. Confident but not aggressive?
> 10. Thrifty about money?
> 11. Co-operative and companionable?
> 12. Patient and understanding with friends?
> 13. A warmhearted and understanding person?
> 14. By your mother's standards, ready for marriage? 23

Indeed, "dieticians, domestic economists, labor experts, and child psychologists seemed to be transforming homemaking into an advanced science," historian Anne F. Scott asserts.[24] While the Journal featured "happy housewife" fiction heroines and ads that implied that the height of a woman's creativity was imagining she could walk a tightrope in her Maidenform Bra,

a vocational guidance expert in the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor claimed thathomemaking was the most important career a woman could choose. [25]

In Period II, the Journal had decreased its monthly offering of fiction, so this may alter the significance of the sample for comparison purposes with Period I. Nondomestic fiction portrayals increased only slightly, from 21.42% in Period I, to 26. 31% in Period II. These data seem to support earlier studies which showed a resistance to change in women's magazine fiction.

Why this change in advertising? Journalism historians Beasley and Silver claim that "no source of images of women has been harder to 'liberate,' because the Constitutional right of freedom of expression has tended to discourage the regulation of advertising's context and interpretation." [26] However, behind what another journalism historian calls the "fluffy top layer" of the women's magazines, there is a solid and powerful base - advertising. [27] The women's magazines involve a huge business investment, much of which advertising finances. Thus advertisers must be particularly aware of the effect of the stereotypes they may use. "Successful marketers understand what most women want," Shirley Young, Executive Vice President and Director of Research Services and Marketing for New York's Grey Advertising, was quoted in 1974. [28] She echoes a long tradition of articles advising advertisers how to deal with the "new woman," articles that began to appear when the women's movement grew, following the 1963

publication of The Feminine Mystique.

For answers to the question why advertisers in this study, unlike fiction writers, seemed to portray women more positively over time, the best source may be the trade journals themselves. One of the earliest examples of the trade journals' direct coverage of the women's movement is Advertising Age's March 11, 1963 piece, well summarized by its headline: "Mass Media Warp Women's Lives, Create Self-Contradictory Patterns, Says Friedan." A straight news story on The Feminine Mystique, and not a partisan review, the article quoted some of Friedan's most critical comments about advertisers. For the first time, advertisers were being informed, in their own journal, of the charges levelled against them by feminists.[29]

From about the mid-sixties on, the trade journals have also included stories on major sex role stereotypes studies such as Courtney and Lockeretz's, earlier mentioned.[30]

Articles on how to pitch ads to women have long been a staple of the advertising journals. From about the mid-sixties on, however, the advertising and marketing research journals have been crammed with caveats to advertisers about women's changing role expectations. The number and breadth of these "warning" articles is striking. One of the classic pieces was entitled "Coping with Women's Lib" in the June 15, 1971 issue of Sales Management. It warned that "The New Woman is young, educated, and on the march. Some of her favorite targets . . . are nestled in your marketingplan. The article warned of possible feminist backlash in the form of boycotts

against those products that "reinforce the stereotype that the female should be content in a homemaker role." It continued:

> 1. Feminist buyers and the people they influence will demand goods and services that facilitate the chances for women to participate in society on an equal basis with men.
>
> 2. There will be an avoidance of products that reinforce the stereotype that the female should be content in a homemaker role.
>
> 3. Influence, perhaps in the form of boycotts, may well be exerted to lessen the distinction between male-oriented and female-oriented products.
>
> Confirmation of these hunches through market research or through the systematic observation of the feminist consumer will serve as guide to action for the marketing strategist.
>
> In the confrontation with Women's Lib, the adaptive marketer will succeed. Those who are less aware may really get to know the wrath of women scorned.

Many of the articles were such very practical pieces that explained exactly how advertisers could appeal to the new, "liberated" woman. Editor and Publisher's 1977 "How to Create Ads that Turn-On Women" summarized most of the previous decade's advice, as it appeared in the advertising and market research journals:

> Depict women as equals in advertisements - and as responsible, prospective customers - not just use them as decorative props.
>
> Avoid the 'man-trap' approach in advertising for personal care products. Emphasize self-enhancement.
>
> Inject humor in advertising with special deftness so that it does not inadvertently become a 'put-down.' 31

A whole genre of trade journal articles that deal with the new working woman - an identified, major demographic trend - appears in the sixties and seventies. "Today the employment of women outside the home is becoming the rule rather than the exception. Are your ads reaching those millions of women who work?" Midge Kovacs asked in 1972 in the pages of Advertising Age.[32] A sidebar offering "Helpful Hints for Liberated Advertisers, or, How to Woo the Working Woman," summarized the prevailing advice in the advertising journals.[33] "The working woman of the '70's is very much her own person, marching to her own drummer," this short piece started. "You can reach her most effectively through understanding her special needs and through an appreciation of her healthy self image." Advertisers were advised to:

Show Her in Her Working Environment
Put Her Behind the Wheel
Emphasize Banking and Insurance
Try Take-Your-Husband-Along Airline Ads
Improve Packaging [34]

As early as 1968, an article in The National Underwriter took the life insurance business to task for neglecting women in advertising and marketing.[35] By 1976, an article in Broadcasting asserted that women were " a growing force to be reckoned with in advertising and financial services."[36] And by 1977, Business Week reported on a recent advertising trend: the slanting of advertisements toward female executives.[37]

Lucy Komisar in her 1972 essay, "The Image of Women in Advertising," expressed the hope that "the constant humiliating

image of the role women are expected to play will draw their degradation in lines too bold and clear to ignore, and that women finally will arise in disgust and outrage ..." [38] Apparently such was the case (as indicated at least by this study) in the seventies. How else to explain the remarkable change in advertising's portrayal of women by Period II (1974, 1975, 1976)? It is clear from the above examples in the trade journals that advertisers had ample opportunity to be made aware of women's changing role expectations.

Certainly, more qualitative research is called for. Pingree, et. al. devised a scale for sexism that attempts to discern qualitative indicators of sexism in advertising. [39] Utilizing only an ordinal consciousness scale is limiting, because it concentrates solely on special roles and relationships, which are purely categorical. To most accurately gauge how advertising has changed since the women's movement first criticized it in 1963, a scale of the Pingree sort would be ideal.

But the fact remains that while fiction seems to have remained consistently traditional in its portrayal of women in Period I and Period II, advertising has indicated a measurable degree of change, probably in response to advertisers' perception of the changing role expectations of women. In 1974, Ladies' Home Journal printed its list of the "Women of the Year," and this list included only one entertainer, Katharine Hepburn. The rest: a congresswoman, a human rights activist, a professional

media person (Barbara walters), an attorney and businesswoman, an athlete (Billie Jean King), an educational administrator, and the Chair... of the Atomic Energy Commission (Dixy Lee Ray). Times had certainly changed, and with them, perhaps, women's expectations of how they would be portrayed - hence advertisers altered their strategies. Otherwise they risked antagonizing an increasingly important market. In fiction, editors had much more freedom and this may well be one reason why there is so little change from Period 1 to Period 11.

Conclusion

When the two content areas within Ladies' Home Journal are compared, it seems that advertisers responded much more to charges of biased portrayals, than did fiction writers. While fiction seems to have remained consistently "traditional" in its portrayal of women throughout the pre-feminist movement period and post-feminist movement period, advertising has indicated a measurable degree of change, toward more nondomestic, active, nontraditional portrayals of women.

Broader-based content analysis of Ladies' Home Journal and other women's magazines in the 1960s and 1970s will no doubt reinforce the conclusion of this preliminary study, of advertisers' greater response to women's changing role expectations.

Backnotes

[1]Betty Friedan, The Feminine Mystique (New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1963), p. 30.

[2]Marya Mannes, But Will It Sell? (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1964), p. 57.

[3]Lucy Komisar, "The Image of women in Advertising," in Woman in Sexist Society, ed. Vivian Gornick and Barbara Moran (New York: New American Library, 1972), p. 2.

[4]William H. Chafe, The American Woman: Her Changing Social and Political Role, 1920-1970 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972), Chapter ten.

[5]Margaret Bailey, "The Women's Magazine Short Story Heroine in 1957 and 1967" (Journalism Quarterly 46: 1969).

[6]Helen Franzwa, "Female Roles in Women's Magazine Fiction 1940 - 1970" in Woman: Dependent or Independent Variable, ed. Rhoda K. Unger and Florence L. Denmark (New York: Psychological Dimensions, 1975).

[7]F.K. Stolz, et. al. "The Occupational Roles of Women in Magazines and Books." Unpublished manuscript, Loyola University, Chicago, 1974.

[8]Charles Lazer and S. Dier, "The Labor Force in Fiction: What Does 'She" Mean" (Journal of Communication 54, 1977).

[9]Carole J. Newkirk, "Female Roles in Non-Fiction of Three Women's Magazines" (Journalism Quarterly 54, 1977).

[10]Virginia Kidd, "Happily Ever After and Other Relationship Styles - Advice on Interpersonal Relations in Popular Magazines, 1951-1973" (Quarterly Journal of Speech 61, no. 1, 1975).

[11]Friedan, The Feminine Mystique, p. 64.

[12]Alice E. Courtney and Sarah Wenick Lockeretz, "A Woman's Place: An Analysis of the Roles Portrayed by Women in Magazine Advertisements" (Journal of Marketing Research 8, February 1971).

[13]L.C. Wagner and J. Banos, "Woman's Place: Follow-up Analysis of Roles Portrayed by Women in Magazine Advertising" (Journal of Market Research 10, 1973).

[14]James D. Culley and Rex Bennett, "Selling Women, Selling Blacks" (Journal of Communication 26, no. 4, 1976).

[15]Jean P. Losco and M. Venkatesan, "Women in Magazine Ads: 1959-1971" (Journal of Advertising Research 15, no. 5, 1975).

[15a]Ahmed Belkaoui and Janice M. Belkaoui, "A Comparative Analysis of the Roles Portrayed by Women in Print Advertising: 1958, 1970, 1972," Journal of Marketing Research 13: 168-172, 1976.

[16]Alison Poe, "Active Women in Ads" (Journal of Communication vol. 26, no. 4, 1976), p. 192.

[17]Lovelle Ray, "The American Women in Mass Media: How Much Emancipation and What Does It Mean?" in Toward a Sociology of Women, ed. Constantina Safilios-Rothschild (Lexington, Massachusetts: Xerox College Publishing, 1972), p. 43.

[18]Suzanne Pingree, et. al. "A Scale for Sexism" (Journal of Communication, vol. 26, no. 4, 1976).

[19]In Period I (1960, 1961, 1962), 16.01% of the total ads classified used a decorative portrayal of a woman's hand or leg (i.e., ads for pantyhose); in Period II (1974, 1975, 1976), only 5.74% of the total ads classified, did so.

[20]Catharine Bennett, "You Know How Women Are."

[21]Jean T. Freeman, "Tamarack."

[22]Friedan, The Feminine Mystique, p. 30.

[23]Clifford R. Adams, "Married . . . but following two separate paths" (Ladies' Home Journal, April 1960, p. 32).

[24]Anne F. Scott, Women in American Life (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970), p. 120.

[25]Marguerite Wykoff Zapoleon, Homemaking as a Career," in The College Girl Looks Ahead to her Career Opportunities (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956).

[26]Maurine Beasley and Sheila Silver, Women in Media: A Documentary Source Book (Washington, D.C.: Women's Institute for Freedom of the Press, 1977), p. 163.

[27]Helen Woodward, The Lady Persuaders (New York: Ivan Obolensky, Inc., 1960).

[28]Quoted in article by Jane Levere, "Portrayal of women in ads defended by top ad women" (Editor and Publisher, June 8, 1974), p. 11.

[29]Also see:
Catherine May, "We Resent Being Called Idiots," Printers' Ink, October 16, 1964; "Femme Pickets in New York Hit Silva Thins, Ivory Liquid, Pristeen, 'Cosmopolitan'", Advertising Age, Vol. 41, August 31, 1970; Don Grant, "Women's Lib 'Dialog' Tells Adfolk: Mend Ad Implications", Advertising Age, Vol. 42, January 25, 1971; "Libs Have Had Little Effect on Women", Advertising Age, Vol. 44, March 19, 1973.

[30]Also see:
William J. Lundstrom and Donald Sciglimpaglia, "Sex Role Portrayals in Advertising," Journal of Marketing, Vol. 41, July 1977.

[31]"How to Create Ads that Turn-On Women" (Editor and Publisher, Vol. 110, No. 36, November 22, 1977).

[32]Midge Kovacs, "Are Your Ads Reaching Those Millions of Women Who Work?" (Advertising Age, Vol. 43, December 4, 1972).

[33]"Helpful Hints for Liberated Advertisers, or, How to Woo the Working Woman" (Advertising Age, Vol.43, December 4, 1972), p. 49.

[34]"Helpful Hints for Liberated Advertisers, . . .", p. 49.

[35]Charlotte Montgomery, "Raps Life Business for Neglecting Women in Advertising, Marketing" (The National Underwriter, Vol. 72, October 12, 1968).

[36]"Women: A Growing Force to be Reckoned with in Advertising Financial Services" (Broadcasting, Vol. 90, April 19, 1976).

[37]"Female Executives Become a Target for Ads" (Business Week, August 22, 1977).

[38]Lucy Komisar, "The Image of Women in Advertising," in Woman in Sexist Society, pp. 304-305.

[39]Suzanne Pingree, et. al., "A Scale for Sexism."

Bibliography

Adams, Clifford R. "Married . . . but following two separate paths." Ladies' Home Journal. April, 1960, p. 32.

"Admen Told, Woo Women with 'Love' and Tenderness." Advertising Age. October 23, 1967.

"Advertisers' Attitudes Changing: Women Now Target for All Kinds of Products." Printers' Ink, August 31, 1962.

Bailey, Margaret. "The Women's Magazine Short Story Heroine in 1957 and 1967." Journalism Quarterly, Vol. 46, 1969.

Beasley, Maurine, and Sheila Silver. Women in Media: A Documentary Source Book. Washington, D.C. Women's Institute for Freedom of the Press, 1977.

Belkaoui, Ahmed, and Janice M. Belkaoui. "A Comparative Analysis of the Roles Portrayed by Women in Print Advertising: 1958, 1970, 1972." Journal of Marketing Research. 13: 168-172, 1976.

Busby, Linda J. "Sex-Role Research on the Mass Media." Journal of Communication, Vol. 25, No. 4 (1975).

Butler, Matilda, and William Paisley. "Magazine Coverage of Women's Rights." Journal of Communication, Winter 1978.

Cadwell, Franchellie. "Shifting Female Market Will Kill Some Products." Advertising Age, Vol. 42, August 16, 1971.

Chafe, William H. The American Woman: Her Changing Social and Political Role, 1920-1970. New York: Oxford University Press, 1974.

Clarke, Peter, and Virginia Esposito. "A Study of Occupational Advice for Women in Magazines." Journalism Quarterly, Vol. 43, 477-485 (Fall 1966).

Courtney, Alice E., and Sarah Wenick Lockeretz. "A Woman's Place: An Analysis of the Roles Portrayed by Women in Magazine Advertisements." Journal of Marketing Research, Vol. 8, February 1971.

Cowan, Ruth Schwartz. "Two Washes in the Morning and a Bridge Party at Night: The American Housewife between the Wars." Women's Studies, Vol. 3, 147-172 (1976).

Crask, Melvin R., Fred D. Reynolds, and William D. Wells, "The Modern Feminine Lifestyle," Journal of Marketing, Vol., 41, July 1977.

Culley, James D., and Rex Bennett. "Selling Women, Selling Blacks."

Journal of Communication, Vol. 26, No. 4 (1976).

Daignault, Phyllis. "Women Break from the Pattern." Sales Management, August 21, 1964, 25-8.

Dier, S., and Charles Lazer. "The Labor Force in Fiction: What Does 'She' Mean." Journal of Communication, Vol. 28, No. 1 (1977-78), 174-181.

Drew, D.G., and Susan H. Miller. "Sex Stereotyping and Reporting." Journalism Quarterly, Vol. 54, No. 1 (Spring 1977).

Embree, Alice. "Media Images 1: Madison Avenue Brainwashing - The Facts," in Sisterhood is Powerful. Ed. Robin Morgan. New York: Random House, 1970.

Farley, Jennie. "Women's Magazines and the Equal Rights Amendment: Friend or Foe?" Journal of Communication, Vol. 28, No. 1 (1978) 187-192.

"Female Executives Become a Target for Ads." Business Week, August 22, 1977, p. 66.

"Femme Pickets in New York Hit Silva Thins, Ivory Liquid, Fristeen, 'Cosmopolitan.'" Advertising Age, Vol. 41, August 31, 1970, p. 14

Ferguson, Marjorie. "Women's Magazines - The Changing Mood." (United Kingdom research.) New Society 29, 475 (August 22, 1974).

Foster, Marnie, and Edward S. Herold. "Changing Sexual References in Mass Circulation Magazines." The Family Coordinator, January 1975, p. 21.

Fox, Harold W., and Stanley R. Renas. "Stereotypes of Women in the Media and their Impact on Women's Careers." Human Resource Management, Vol. 16, Spring 1977, 28-31.

Fram, Eugene, and Andrew DuBrin. "Coping with Women's Lib." Sales Management, Vol. 106, No. 13, June 15, 1971, pp. 20-21,60.

Franzwa, Helen. "Female Roles in Women's Magazine Fiction, 1940-1970," in Woman: Dependent or Independent Variable. Ed. Rhoda K. Unger and Florence L. Denmark. New York: Psychological Dimensions, 1975.

----------"Working Women in Fact and Fiction." Journal of Communication, No. 24, 1974, 104-109.

Friedan, Betty. The Feminine Mystique. New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1963.

Friedman, Leslie. Sex Role Stereotyping in the Mass Media: An Annotated Bibliography. New York: Garland Publishing Co., Inc., 1977.

Grant, Don. "Women's Lib 'Dialog' Tells Adfolk: Mend Ad Implications." Advertising Age, Vol. 42, January 25, 1971.

Griffith, Ann. "The Magazines Women Read." American Mercury 68 (March, 1949).

"Helpful Hints for Liberated Advertisers, or, How to Woo the Working Woman." Advertising Age, Vol. 43, December 4, 1972, p. 49.

Hole, Judith, and Ellen Levine. The Rebirth of Feminism. New York: Quadrangle Books, Inc., 1971.

Kidd, Virginia. "Happily Ever After and Other Relationship Styles - Advice on Interpersonal Relations in Popular Magazines, 1951-1973." Quarterly Journal of Speech, Vol. 61, No. 1, 1975, 31-39.

Komisar, Lucy. "The Image of Women in Advertising," in Woman in Sexist Society. Ed. Vivian Gornick, Barbara Moran. New York: New American Library, 1972.

Kovacs, Midge. "Are Your Ads Reaching Those Millions of Women Who Work?" Advertising Age, Vol. 43, December 4, 1972, p. 48.

---------- "New Attitude Toward Women." Advertising Age, Vol. 43, March 13, 1972.

---------- "Where is Women's Place? Home, Say Ads." Advertising Age, Vol. 43, July 17, 1972.

---------- "Women's Lib: Do's and Don'ts for Ad Men." Marketing/Communications, January 1971.

---------- "Women Simply Don't Recognize Themselves in Many Ads Today." Advertising Age 48 (June 12, 1972).

Lazarsfeld, Paul J., and Robert K. Merton. "Mass Communication, Popular Taste, and Organized Social Action," in The Communication of Ideas. Ed. Lyman Bryson. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948.

Lazer, William, and John E. Smallwood. "The Changing Demographics of Women." Journal of Marketing, Vol. 41, July 1977, 14-22.

LeBouef, Robert A., and Marc Matre. "How Different Readers Perceive Magazine Stories and Characters." Journalism Quarterly, Vol, 54, No. 1 (Spring 1977).

Leonard, Mary. "Art Thou Sexist, Fair Adman?" The National Observer, November 9, 1974.

Levere, Jane. "Portrayal of Women in Ads Defended by Top Ad Women." Editor and Publisher, June 8, 1974.

"Libs Have Little Effect on Women." Advertising Age, Vol. 44, March 19, 1973.

Losco, Jean P., and M. Venkatesan. "Women in Magazine Ads: 1959-1971." Journal of Advertising Research, Vol. 15, No. 5, 1975, 49-54.

Lundstrom, William J., and Donald Sciglimpaglia. "Sex Role Portrayals in Advertising." Journal of Marketing, Vol. 41, July 1977.

McBride, Sarah Elizabeth. "Women in the Popular Magazines for Women in America: 1830-1956." Unpublished dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1966.

McCall, Suzanne H. "Meet the 'Workwife.'" Journal of Marketing, Vol.41, July 1977.

"Male-Type Ads May Be Aimed at Women Following Harris Poll." Advertising Age, Vol 43, March 27, 1962, p. 2.

Mannes, Marya. But Will It Sell? Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1964.

Marzolf, Marion. Up from the Footnote. New York: Hastings House, 1977.

"Mass Media Warp Women's Lives, Create Self-Contradicting Patterns, Says Friedan." Advertising Age, March 11, 1963.

May, Catherine. "We Resent Being Called Idiots." Printers' Ink, October 16, 1964.

Millard, Pat. "Ad Men: Look at Us Again." Printers' Ink, June 5, 1964.

Millum, Trevor. Images of Women: Advertising in Women's Magazines. (United Kingdom research.) London: Chatto and Windus, 1975.

Montgomery, Charlotte. "Raps Life Business for Neglecting Women in Advertising and Marketing." The National Underwriter, Vol. 72, October 12, 1968, pp. 36-7.

Morse, Julia. "Eight Easy Ways to Sell a Woman in Ads." Editor and Publisher, April 2, 1966.

"The New American Woman." Marketing/Communications, July 1970.

Newkirk, Carole J. "Female Roles in Non-Fiction of Three Women's Magazines." Journalism Quarterly 54, 1977.

Peterson, Theodore. Magazines in the Twentieth Century. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1958.

Phillips, Robert A., and Paul C. Rosenblatt. "Family Articles in Popular Magazines - Advice to Writers, Editors, and Teachers of Consumers." Family Coordinator, Vol. 24, No. 3, 1975, 267-271.

Pingree, Suzanne, et. al. "A Scale for Sexism." Journal of Communication, Vol. 26, No. 4 (1976).

Poe, Alison. "Active Women in Ads." Journal of Communication, Vol. 26, No. 4 (1976).

Popa, Mary. "Study Indicates Ads Present Too Limited View of Women." Advertising Age, Vol. 41, December 14, 1970, p. 32.

Ray, Lovelle. "The American Women in Mass Media: How Much Emancipation and What Does It Mean?" in Toward a Sociology of Women. Ed. Constantina Safilios-Rothschild. Lexington, Massachusetts: Xerox College Publishing, 1972.

"Revolution and Readjustment: A Significant Change for Marketers." Printers' Ink, August 30, 1963.

Santi, Tina. "Today's Woman Explodes Yesterday's Ad Dream World." Advertising Age, Vol. 45, March 18, 1974, 49-50.

Scott, Anne Firor. Women in American Life. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970.

Sederberg, Kathryn. "Is It Denigrating for a Woman to be Put on a Pedestal?" Advertising Age, Vol. 41, February 23, 1970, 2-3.

Smith, M. Dwayne and Marc Matre. "Social Norms and Sex Roles in Romance and Adventure Magazines." Journalism Quarterly 52, 1975, 309-315.

Stolz, F.K., et. al. "The Occupational Roles of Women in Magazines and Books." Unpublished manuscript, Loyola University, Chicago, 1974.

Wagner, L.C., and J. Banos. "Woman's Place: Follow-up Analysis of Roles Portrayed by Women in Magazine Advertising." Journal of Market Research 10 (1973.)

Welter, Barbara. "The Cult of True Womanhood: 1820-1860." American Quarterly 18 (Summer 1966).

"What Ads Appeal Best to Women." Printers' Ink, February 17, 1961.

Willett, Roslyn. "Do Not Stereotype Women - An Appeal to Advertisers." Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 63, No. 7 (October 1971).

Wolseley, Roland E. The Changing Magazine. New York: Hastings House, 1973.

"Women: A Growing Force to be Reckoned with in Advertising Financial Services." Broadcasting, Vol. 90, No. 12 April 19, 1976.

"Women: A Closer Look from U.S. Advertisers." Special Report. Printers' Ink, April 6, 1962, 27-30.

Wood, James Playsted. Magazines in the United States. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1971 (third edition).

Woodward, Helen. The Lady Persuaders. New York: Ivan Obolensky, Inc., 1960.

Zapoleon, Marguerite Wykoff. "Homemaking as a Career," in The College Girl Looks Ahead to Her Career Opportunities. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956.

Zube. "Changing Concepts of Morality: 1948-1969." Social Forces, March, 1972.